UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,994	06/17/2005	Michael Rosenbauer	2002P01290WOUS	8036
	7590 10/21/200 PPLIANCES CORPOI	EXAMINER		
	AL PROPERTY DEPA	GOLIGHTLY, ERIC WAYNE		
NEW BERN, N	= =	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1792	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/21/2009	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

NBN-IntelProp@bshg.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/539,994	ROSENBAUER, MICHAEL	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Eric Golightly	1792	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>05 October 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperior Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(the content of the co	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejectio	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date thave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be	out prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	001100
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	ΓE below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	ter form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: No amendments are presently proposed. (			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	·		
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·	•	_
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>20 and 21</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>23-42</u> . AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bubecause applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fails see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a ).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12.	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Michael Kornakov/	/E. G./		
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1792	Examiner, Art Unit 1792		
	•		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that: 1) 10039408 to Zucholl ("Zucholl") does not teach or suggest using dosing device data; 2 WO 0032864 to Mourad ("Mourad") does not teach or suggest packaging of a dosing device; and 3) it would not have been obvious to the skilled artisan to associate information concerning a dosing device with the packaging of the dosing device.

Applicant's arguments are not persuasive because: 1 and 2) One cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). It is Mourad, not Zucholl, which is relied upon to provide the feature of using dosing device data (see Office action mailed 7/7/2009 at page 3, second paragraph, citing EPO machine translation of Mourad at, inter alia, paragraphs beginning, "The parts of the wash program" and "The detergent dosage represents"). Further, it is Zucholl, not Mourad, which is relied upon to provide the feature of packaging of a dosing device (see Office action mailed 7/7/2009 at page 3, first paragraph, citing EPO machine translation of Zucholl detailed description, paragraph beginning "In an other [sic] particularly favourable embodiment a reading"); and 3) as discussed in Office action mailed 7/7/2009 at page 4, first paragraph, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious that the information be associated with the packaging of the dosing device in order to enhance operator and bar card reading of the information.